



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Hispanic American Historical Review

Vol. III

FEBRUARY, 1920

No. 1

HISPANIC AMERICAN APPRECIATIONS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE¹

The purpose of this article is to describe the reactions produced in Hispanic America by the application of the Monroe Doctrine to the boundary dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain.

To suggest briefly the origins of the dispute. England, who secured the title to Dutch Guiana in 1814, had asserted a right to territory which was claimed by Venezuela as the heir of Spain. The territory in dispute eventually included a region which extended in a southeasterly direction from the Orinoco delta to the Essequibo River. Near the northern edge of the disputed territory was the estuary of the Orinoco River—a key to the vast hinterland of South America. England offered to settle the controversy by negotiating a treaty, while Venezuela in vain expressed her desire to submit the dispute to arbitration. On February 20, 1887, after vainly asking English colonists to evacuate valuable territory in the Orinoco delta, Venezuela announced that she had suspended diplomatic relations with the government of England. Evidently the Venezuelan government feared that the English desired to secure a strategic position at the mouth of the Orinoco. To paraphrase the language of Rafael Seijas, Venezuela's leading authority on inter-

¹ A paper read, in part, at the conference on Hispanic American history of the American Historical Association at Cleveland on December 30, 1919.

national law, the acquisition of that delta by England would have made the citizens of Venezuela her tributaries and colonists.

Invoking the Monroe Doctrine, in May, 1887, Venezuela's minister at Washington asked Secretary of State Bayard to promote the adjustment of the controversy by arbitration.² This appeal was echoed in Venezuela. Early in 1894 a contributor to the *Diario de Caracas* argued that the expansion of England in Guiana was a breach of the Monroe Doctrine, for the districts which were being taken from the Venezuelan republic were thereby made "the possessions of monarchical England."³ In the following year Rafael Seijas epitomized his country's position in these words:

Venezuela maintains that Holland did not possess all that territory which England claims as her successor. This assertion is based upon countless proofs. England has advanced her stations along the borders of the Orinoco as far as the Amacuro. . . . In this grave conflict Venezuela has appealed to her sisters on this continent, and particularly to the United States of America.⁴

Secretary of State Olney's dogmatic dispatch to the United States minister in London on July 20, 1895, interpreting the Monroe Doctrine in a most liberal fashion and asserting that "the fiat of the United States was law upon the American continent" did not induce Lord Salisbury, the English secretary of state for foreign affairs, to arbitrate the controversy.⁵ Hence, on December 7, 1895, President Cleveland sent a trenchant message to Congress expressing his view that the extension of boundaries by a European power so as to take possession of the territory of an Hispanic American state against her will constituted a case under the Monroe Doctrine and asserting that this Doctrine found its recognition in certain principles of international law.⁶

² Cleveland, *The Venezuelan Boundary Controversy*, 71.

³ *Diario de Caracas* as quoted in *Límites de Guyana*, 49.

⁴ Seijas, "To the London Times" (Translated from "Á The London Times", in *Diario de Caracas*, November 25, 1895), p. 20.

⁵ For Olney's dispatch, see *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1895, part I, pp. 545-562.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 543.

In Venezuela Cleveland's vigorous policy was greeted with enthusiasm. Reports or summaries of his message were soon printed in her newspapers.⁷ On December 18, *El Pregonero* of Caracas circulated broadsides proposing that a patriotic manifestation should be held to honor the United States in the person of her minister in Venezuela. Such a tribute was paid on that very evening. In an account of the celebration this journal declared, "The die is cast and the generous supporters of the Monroe Doctrine are ranged by our side."⁸

Venezuela's Academy of History held a special meeting on December 23 to voice its "profound gratitude" at the policy pursued by the President and the Congress of the United States in the Guiana boundary dispute.⁹ The Simón Bolívar Club of Caracas soon prepared a program for a monster celebration to take place on December 25. As a badge its members used a rosette bearing the colors of Venezuela and the United States. Upon Christmas Day a procession accordingly started from the Plaza Bolívar and passed through the principal streets of Caracas, preceded by the standards of Venezuela and the United States. In describing the march of his jubilant fellow countrymen through avenues whose balconies were decorated with American flags and crowded with Venezuelan belles, the editor of *El Pregonero* affirmed that the pen fell helpless from his fingers. A Venezuelan made a speech in front of the American legation avowing that because of the declaration by the United States that the western hemisphere was not open to the establishment of protectorates or spheres of influence by European powers the names of President Cleveland and of the nation which he so worthily represented were engraven in the memories of his fellowcitizens. In the plaza near the national pantheon another

⁷ Mention of Cleveland's message to Congress was made in a cablegram from Washington printed in *El Pregonero*, Caracas, December 6, 1895. On December 10 the same journal published a resumé of the message. On January 2, 1896, the *Diario de Caracas*, Caracas, published a summary of the message and excerpts in Spanish translation; and January 4, 1896, a translation was published in *El Pregonero*.

⁸ *El Pregonero*, December 19, 1895.

⁹ *Diario de Caracas*, January 10, 1896.

orator made a speech at the foot of Miranda's statue declaring that by the acceptance of the moral support of the United States his fellow countrymen had contracted a debt of gratitude which they would never forget. Upon approaching the Washington Plaza the band that led the procession played the Venezuelan national hymn. Enthusiastic speeches were made before the statue of George Washington and floral decorations were laid around its pedestal. In the words of the *Diario de Caracas*:

The monument of the father of Cleveland's country was completely covered with crosses, flags, flowers, and floral emblems which were placed there by our noble people as a token of their gratitude to the great nation of the North.¹⁰

Then the crowd proceeded to the mansion of President Joaquín Crespo. There a speaker declared in exuberant phrases that the American eagle would protect those Spanish American peoples who were struggling for their rights. On behalf of Venezuela's president, his secretary of foreign relations, J. F. Castillo, responded stating that his government counted upon the support of the United States—the great, progressive, magnanimous nation that had surprised the universe “with her sovereign respect for the immortal principles upon which were based the Doctrine of Monroe, that safeguard of American public law.”¹¹ The enthusiastic Venezuelans ended their march in the central plaza at the foot of the equestrian statue of Simón Bolívar, where a speech was delivered by a representative of United States citizens residing in the capital city, and where—in a fashion typical of Spanish America, Venezuelan poets chanted their verses.¹²

On January 4, 1896, prominent citizens of Caracas gave a banquet in the national library in honor of the American legation. The arches and columns of that building were decorated with the interlaced colors of Venezuela and the United States, and in its halls were placed busts of Bolívar, Monroe, and Cleveland. A military band played the national hymns of Venezuela

¹⁰ *Diario de Caracas*, December 27, 1895.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

and the United States. In eloquent Castilian phrases José R. Núñez praised the policy of the United States, characterizing Monroe as "the worthy founder of the expansive doctrine.

"¹³

The aggressive attitude of the United States government evoked approval from *juntas*, municipal councils, and local societies. Several Venezuelan states displayed their patriotic sentiments. On January 4, 1896, the legislative assembly of the state of Zulia, inspired by "sentiments of genuine gratitude because of the noble conduct of the President and the Congress of the United States," thankful "to the heroic North-American people for the applause with which they had received the transcendental decisions of their government," anxious to furnish "in case of war as large a contingent as possible" to support the cause of Venezuela which was protected by the United States "in the name of the Monroe Doctrine", resolved to thank President Cleveland for his message. This assembly also resolved to express gratification to the Congress of the United States "for the good reception which it had given to that notable message", and for its courageous deliberations about the Monroe Doctrine—"the safeguard of the rights of the American Continent!"¹⁴ Two days later Zulia's legislature adopted a resolution declaring that the intervention of the United States government insured a satisfactory solution of the dangerous controversy over Guiana. It decided to congratulate President Crespo upon "the energetic and decided attitude which the government and the people of the United States had assumed. . . ."¹⁵

On January 7, President Aquilino Juárez of the state of Lara declared to the legislature that the Venezuelan people should be grateful for the

singular demonstration of confraternity which had been shown them by the Great Republic of the North, the nurse of Washington and Monroe. . . .¹⁶

¹³ *El Pregonero*, January 6, 1896.

¹⁴ *Diario de Caracas*, January 21, 1896.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, January 16, 1896. At this juncture the chief executive of each state in the Venezuelan union was ordinarily styled president.

Shortly afterwards this legislature thanked the United States which, "in the name of justice and civilization", had so generously sprung to Venezuela's side! It further resolved to express to President Cleveland in the name of its constituents

the most sincere sentiments of gratitude and of patriotic support for his eloquent and high-minded message to Congress in defense of our territory. . . .¹⁷

President Nicolás Rolando of the state of Barcelona sent a special message to the legislature of his state upon January 8, mentioning the pleasure with which the president and the people of Venezuela had received the news that the United States had eventually adopted the generous resolution of declaring in force the Doctrine announced by President Monroe in 1823 and of becoming, in accordance therewith, the energetic defender of our rights!¹⁸

On the following day President Antonio Fernández of the state of Falcón addressed a special message to the legislature of his state which began in these words:

The Congress of the great North-American nation and her worthy President have given such decided manifestations of sympathy in favor of Venezuela with regard to the Guiana boundary that, from our highest official circles to our humblest villages, voices of gratitude have been heard.¹⁹

Upon the same day the legislature of that state adopted a resolution asking the national congress to pass an act that would express Venezuela's acknowledgment of the aid which the United States had offered in the boundary dispute with England.²⁰

In response to a message of the president, on January 11, the legislature of the state of the Andes, declaring that the United States through her President had invoked "the Doctrine of Monroe to protect Venezuelan soil from unjust usurpation",

¹⁷ *Diario de Caracas*, February 13, 1896.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, January 14, 1896.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, January 23, 1896.

resolved "to protest energetically against the unjustifiable aggressions of England" and to solicit of the national congress an expression of gratitude to the United States government for "the generous intervention which it had decided to make in the frontier differences. . . ." ²¹ Two weeks later the legislature of the state of Zamora, "hearkening to the voice of gratitude" that resounded from one end of Venezuela to the other, "heaping benedictions upon the noble and generous proceedings of the most excellent President of the United States", who to prevent England from despoiling Venezuela of her territory, had proclaimed "the Monroe Doctrine to be an inviolable principle of international law", resolved to transmit to President Cleveland, as well as to the Congress and the people of the United States, through the American minister at Caracas, the homage of its profound gratitude. It further resolved to ask the national congress to express at the next session by a solemn resolution Venezuela's thankfulness to the United States for her generous intervention. ²²

Some interesting comments upon the Monroe Doctrine appeared in the *Diario de Caracas*, the organ of the Venezuelan government. On January 13, 1896, that newspaper declared:

Propitious winds now blow from one extreme of the continent to the other. The right of preservation prevails over every other consideration; and the Monroe Doctrine, based on this right which is vital for individuals and for organizations, now assumes the character of a formidable principle:—it is a formula that will preserve the existence of our incipient democracies. . . . To the policy of the United States, which is designed to keep this doctrine vigorous, the other nations of America ought to respond. Isolated they can do nothing for themselves, but united they will constitute a respectable and efficacious force for the protection of their sovereignty against any foreign invasion.

²¹ *Diario de Caracas*, January 17, 1896.

²² *Ibid.*, February 6, 1896.

On February 7 that journal made this further comment:

In the Old World the Hispanic American countries are generally considered as semi-barbarous, without sufficient strength to assure the inviolability of their rights or to make themselves respected in any emergency. European states have viewed those countries as an easy prize—a prey in which powerful nations might with impunity fasten their teeth, by extending their conquests and by advocating unjust demands and claims. Experience has demonstrated the necessity of terminating these abuses. It has shown the need for a union of the forces of the continent to guarantee mutually the rights and prerogatives of each one of the confederated nations. . . . President Monroe furnished a formula in the celebrated message that bears his name; Cleveland and the United States Congress have amplified it in connection with our dispute with England; and eventually there is spreading from the Hudson River to Cape Horn the conception of a grand American alliance as the most expeditious and imperative measure for the salvation of the rights and the sovereignty of our young republics.

On February 20, 1896, President Crespo sent a significant message to the Venezuelan congress. After mentioning “the act of noble justice” of the United States government in regard to the threat upon the integrity of the American nations caused by the pending boundary dispute, he suggested that congress should give concrete expression to the nation’s gratitude.²³ Thus it was that on March 9 following both houses of Venezuela’s congress adopted four declarations: (1) that as the advocate of “the territorial integrity of the independent nations of the New World,” the President of the United States had “acquired a special claim to the gratitude of the people of this continent”; (2) that with regard to an “ancient and provoking controversy” Cleveland had suggested an important viewpoint from which it could be observed that the doctrine of “the theoretical equality of states” was “the most respectable principle of international life”; (3) that by its response to “the noble ideas of the chief magistrate” the Congress of the United States had “opened new and hopeful vistas in a dispute” which

²³ *Diario de Caracas*, February 24, 1896.

had been confined to "the narrow sphere of fruitless discussion with peril to the general interests of the continent"; and (4) that, because of their policy, the Supreme Magistrates of the United States deserved "in a singular manner an expression of affection" which would embody "all the grateful sentiments" of the Venezuelan republic "toward the glorious fatherland of Washington and Monroe!" The Venezuelan congress consequently resolved to

bestow upon the honorable Congress of the United States of America and upon the most excellent President of that nation, an homage of gratitude for the eminent service which they have rendered to the other independent peoples of the New World, and especially to the Venezuelan people, by the policy of promoting the peaceful and decorous settlement of the boundary controversy with British Guiana in a manner consonant with international justice.²⁴

In a report of the committee of foreign relations of the Venezuelan chamber of deputies the policy of the United States was described as an "application of the celebrated Doctrine of Monroe".²⁵

Similar sentiments were expressed in other Hispanic American countries. Both houses of congress of the United States of Brazil unanimously adopted a motion approving President Cleveland's message of December 17. The upper house of that congress transmitted greetings to the United States Senate about this message, declaring that Cleveland had "strenuously" guarded "the dignity, the sovereignty, and the freedom of the American nations".²⁶

In Guayaquil, Ecuador, *El Tiempo* published an article entitled "International Questions", stating that the attitude assumed by the United States in the boundary dispute had profoundly affected the minds of Spanish Americans:

²⁴ *Acuerdo del Congreso de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela dictado el 9 de Marzo de 1896*, pp. 7-9.

²⁵ *Diario de Caracas*, April 14, 1896.

²⁶ *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1895, part I, p. 76.

Every person now feels that the saving Doctrine of Monroe will cease to be a purely speculative principle or a principle of merely historic value, as it has been designated, and that it will become a formula of our public international law. If the Great Republic actually wishes to make effective her protective influence in favor of the weak nationalities of Spanish America, it will become the safeguard of the interests of the continent. Until the present moment, we have been almost constantly threatened by the powerful influences of foreign nations that have interests which they wish to make prevail in America. . . . We are weak—this is the reason for the outrage. The resolute attitude of the United States in behalf of Spanish American interests involves neither the implicit acceptance by small republics of a protectorate with shameful results nor a tutelage of indefinite duration.²⁷

At the capital of Guatemala, on January 24, 1896, a masonic lodge drew up an address to President Cleveland, thanking him for the position which he had taken in the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute. It declared that he had given "complete efficacy to the Monroe Doctrine," which had been

no more than a speculative hope with regard to the ambitious attempts of certain European powers to absorb the weak countries of America. . . . For, if Monroe announced the Doctrine which bears his name . . . Cleveland is the personage who gave it living reality in the law of nations and in the practical jurisprudence of the peoples of the earth! Monroe and Cleveland will be the personages consecrated by law in the nineteenth century; and their names will become a symbol of redemption in the melancholy struggle of the American peoples for the vindication of their rights!²⁸

About the same time *El Ferrocarril* of Sonsonata in Salvador also praised Cleveland and Monroe:

Monroe has opened to Cleveland the doors of the temple. In his turn Cleveland, if possible, has conferred greater immortality upon Monroe. America has immortalized both presidents, for she does justice to her benefactors. The message of Cleveland . . . has been the complement of American independence; or rather this state paper,

²⁷ As quoted in *Diario de Caracas*, February 5, 1896.

²⁸ As reprinted from *El Progreso Nacional*, Guatemala, in *Diario de Caracas*, April 30, 1896.

which has made effective and practical a saving Doctrine that for many years was considered platonic and theoretical, has had the effect of a moral and political victory! Without cannon or bloodshed the exposition of the illustrious President has been as significant as a new battle of Ayacucho: it is a new seal of our continental emancipation! Spanish Americans actually do not know whether to accord more greatness and nobility to the champions of their independence or to Monroe and Cleveland—the champions of their international emancipation. . . . In that achievement Monroe has been the brain and Cleveland the arm!²⁹

The president of Mexico was asked to express his sentiments regarding Cleveland's policy. Hence when he opened a session of the Mexican congress on April 10, 1896, President Díaz expressed his opinion concerning the Monroe Doctrine:

Without entering into discussions in respect to its origin and to the historic moment which caused its enunciation, without considering the details about the just limitations that its own author set to it, and which President Cleveland has recalled with so much acumen, the government of Mexico cannot do less than show itself the partisan of a Doctrine that condemns as contrary to the established order any attack of monarchial Europe upon the republics of America—those independent nations which are today administered under a popular form of government.

President Díaz then suggested that each of the republics of the continent,

by means of a declaration similar to that of President Monroe should proclaim that an attack by any foreign power which aims to impair the territory or the independence or to alter the institutions of one of the American republics would be considered, by each nation making the declaration, as an offense against herself. . . . In this manner the Doctrine which is today designated the Monroe Doctrine would become a truly American Doctrine in the most ample sense. . . .³⁰

²⁹ *El Ferrocarril*, Sonsonata, El Salvador, as quoted in *El Pregonero*, March 18, 1896.

³⁰ As quoted in *La Época*, Bogotá, June 2, 1896.

President Cleveland's policy attracted considerable attention in Colombia's capital. On January 4, 1896, *La Época* of Bogotá published an editorial entitled "The Practice of the Monroe Doctrine". The editor praised the application of that Doctrine by President Cleveland. He declared that, confronted by England's abuse of force, the land of Washington had shocked Europe by constituting herself, in the name of justice and of the New World, an arbitrator between the strong and the weak for the adjudication of the dispute. Comparing Lord Salisbury with the Prince of Denmark, he asserted that, since the President's message, the noble lord's native hue of resolution had been sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought. Newspapers of Bogotá soon published Cleveland's message in Spanish.³¹ On January 9, *El Heraldo* contained an editorial entitled "The New Year" which was introduced by pictures of Monroe and Cleveland. That journal expressed its opinion of Cleveland's policy thus:

Admirable is the rôle which the Great Republic founded by the virtuous Washington plays in the Guiana controversy! By the side of Washington there will figure honorably in history Monroe and Cleveland, his worthy successors. Both of honest heart: the first was a glorious precursor of the independence of his country; and the second is conspicuous among all the politicians of the present epoch because of the elevation of his views and the rectitude of his character!

Prominent citizens of Bogotá gave a banquet to the ministers of Venezuela and the United States at that capital to show their appreciation of the use of the Monroe Doctrine in the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute. This celebration was held in a hall which was decorated with the flags of Venezuela and the United States and adorned with portraits of Washington, Bolívar, and Cleveland. Upon that occasion the Colombian thinker, Salvador Camacho Roldán, made an address lauding the actions of Cleveland who had

ratified the declarations of the Monroe Doctrine in connection with the discussions about the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana.

³¹ *La Época*, January 7, 1896; *El Heraldo*, Bogotá, January 23, 1896.

Camacho Roldán said that

from every point of view the intervention of the United States in the discussions of Great Britain with Venezuela is one of the most important international events of the nineteenth century. In Mr. Cleveland's mind there is not a shadow of egotism but simply a spirit of elevated justice and the magnanimity of the strong in defense of the rights of the weak. . . . ³²

At that banquet the Colombian poet, Diego Uribe, toasted Colombia's sister, Venezuela, and chanted the praises of the United States as the fountain of American progress, the nation which had conferred liberty upon the slaves—the land where America could behold shining purely and serenely, *la Libertad!*³³

Salud por ese pueblo soberano
Siempre en nobleza y en honor fecundo,
Que á través de las olas del Oceano
Tiende hacia el Sol su poderoso mano
Para afianzar la libertad de un mundo.

In phrases scarcely less poetic José María Quijano Wallis gave a toast in honor of the ministers of Venezuela and of the United States at Bogotá. Quijano Wallis characterized Cleveland's message as "noble and energetic". He declared that, invoking the political maxims of Franklin, Adams, and Monroe, the United States had faced the Mistress of the Seas and had addressed to that powerful usurper these words:

When in families that lack maternal support the young and feeble daughters are threatened with unjust aggressions, the oldest sister takes the place of the mother in order to support them and to maintain their rights. In the family of American nations, I am that elder sister; and I shall know how to fulfill that dignified and noble mission. The Continent of Columbus is my home and the home of my family. Our right of exclusive property over it is inalienable; for it emanates from nature and from our strength! I shall not permit you to profane it, nor to usurp it! My flag shall shield its interests, which are also mine!

³² *El Heraldó*, January 9, 1896.

³³ *La Época*, January 10, 1896.

My ships will protect its ports against the explosions of your bombs; and the breasts of my soldiers, if need be, will receive the shots of your cannon at the same time as the breasts of Venezuelans!³⁴

Although not fully aware of the extent to which the policy of the United States had been praised in Hispanic America, yet in a letter to President Cleveland on November 28, 1896, President Crespo said:

The vigor with which you have played your active rôle in this noble task—whatever may be the final outcome—will make your name worthy of eternal praise not only in your own great nation and in Venezuela but in the entire American continent.³⁵

When the terms of the proposed Anglo-Venezuelan treaty of arbitration became known in Caracas some dissatisfaction was indeed displayed. Expressing gratitude at the application of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States, Tomás Michelena voiced his displeasure with the treaty because it seemingly confirmed England's territorial claims.³⁶ On December 11, 1896, *El Pregonero* contained an editorial upon the same topic. Its most emphatic objection was couched in these words, evidently referring to the doctrine of prescription embodied in the convention:

One thing is clear from the project of the treaty:—England wishes to possess herself legally of what she occupied by force.

But the Venezuelan secretary of foreign relations, J. E. Rojas, rendered a more tolerant judgment. In his message to congress on February 20, 1897, he said:

The good offices thus exercised by the government at Washington have been in conformity with the desires of Venezuela. That country appealed to the Great Republic for a decorous solution of its conflict with Great Britain, and her appeal was heard. Although at present

³⁴ *Ibid.*, January 11, 1896.

³⁵ Reprinted from the *Boletín Oficial*, in *El Pregonero*, December 8, 1896. Crespo's letter was in reply to a letter from Cleveland, dated November 12, 1896.

³⁶ Michelena mentioned not only Cleveland's message but "the incomparable note of Secretary Olney", *El Pregonero*, December 10, 1896.

the British cabinet insists upon a territorial exclusion openly rejected by Venezuela some time ago, yet the path marked out by the United States was the one best adapted to bring the contending nations with the least delay to a positive harmony of opinions about arbitration.³⁷

After the irritating boundary controversy was peacefully adjusted by an arbitral decision that partook of the nature of a compromise, in a commentary upon the policy pursued by the United States toward Hispanic America, the Venezuelan littérateur, Rufino Blanco-Fombona, aptly said:

If the United States should aid Hispanic Americans in case of a conflict, when the interest of the people who proclaimed that Doctrine runs parallel to our interest, in order that the Empire of a European power may not rival her upon this continent—blessed be the name of Monroe! Used as a whet to the epicurean appetite of certain Yankees, the Doctrine of Monroe would be a medicine no less dangerous than the malady which it was designed to cure! But how that Doctrine has puckered the faces of the filibustering powers of Europe! The truth is that without the Monroe Doctrine, Venezuela would have lost Guiana, and England would have been planted upon the banks of the Orinoco River, soon to become its Mistress!³⁸

What conclusions do this study justify? It is clear that President Cleveland's message and not Secretary Olney's dispatch was the state paper upon which Hispanic American editors and publicists focused their attention. There is ample evidence to prove that in 1895 and 1896 the people of Venezuela gladly welcomed the application of the Monroe Doctrine to their long-standing boundary dispute with Great Britain. Evidence likewise shows that—contrary to views entertained by some students of the Monroe Doctrine—this application evoked favorable appreciations in Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador, Central America, and Mexico. The national governments of Venezuela and Brazil publicly expressed their sincere gratification at Cleveland's policy. In certain parts of Hispanic America that policy

³⁷ *Libro Amarillo de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela*, 1897, p. xxvii. Rojas mentioned Venezuela's gratitude to Cleveland, to his 'very worthy secretary of state, Mr. Olney'; and to the United States Congress, *ibid.*, p. xxviii.

³⁸ Blanco-Fombona, *La Americanización del Mundo*, 11.

evoked sentiments favoring a Pan American Monroe Doctrine as well as suggestions concerning an American league of nations. These favorable reactions to the policy of the United States toward Venezuela—in contrast with unfavorable criticisms evoked by other “applications” of the Monroe Doctrine—support the conclusion that, although Hispanic American thinkers have disapproved of “the india-rubber Doctrine” upon certain occasions, as when used to justify the establishment of a protectorate over a nation of Hispanic America, yet they have approved the Monroe Doctrine when it was simply used to protect an Hispanic American state against foreign aggression. The application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Anglo-Venezuelan boundary controversy is perhaps unique because few unfavorable comments were made by Hispanic Americans upon the policy pursued by the United States.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.